

Remarks

The applicants have corrected drawing and specification discrepancies noted in the Office Action mailed on August 25, 2004 and additional typographical errors found during a review of the application and request that these amendments be entered to correct these minor formalities prior to issue as allowed by 37 C.F.R. § 1.312.

Telephone Interview Summary

On November 16, 2004, the Mike Baldauff and Leonard Hope interviewed Examiners Robert Stevens and Joseph Feild. Claims 10 and 12 were discussed along with MS Word User's Guide version 6.0, which was cited for teaching the recitations of claims 10 and 12. An agreement was reached that the cited art did not read on the recitations of claims 10 when rewritten to include the recitations of claim 12. The Examiners agreed to perform another prior art search, and if no new applicable art was found, to enter an Examiner's Amendment to amend independent claim 10 to incorporate the recitations of claim 12.

Drawings

In the Office Action mailed on August 25, 2004, FIG. 1 was objected to for failing to include reference characters 151 and 152 mentioned in the description. FIG. 1 has been amended to add reference characters 151 and 152. The drawings were also objected to because reference characters 139 and 206 were both used to designate Formatting Rules and reference characters 138 and 204 were both used to designate Formatting Component. The applicants have amended FIG. 2 to redesignate reference characters 204 and 206 as reference characters 138 and 139, respectively. The applicants have amended the specification on pages 12-14 to reflect this change.

FIGS. 4, 9, 10, and 11 were objected to for designating multiple routine exits. These figures, as well as FIG. 7, have been amended to designate the exits within a single process as a single reference number. The specification on pages 18, 34-36, 39, and 42 were amended to reflect the amendments to the figures. FIGS. 7 and 9 were objected to because reference characters "A" and "B" were both used to designate input/output paths within both figures. The

applicants have amended FIG. 9 to redesignate reference characters “A” and “B” as “C” and “D,” respectively. Additionally, FIGS. 3-12 were objected to because of missing lead lines. The applicants have amended FIGS. 3-12 to correct the omission. Finally, the drawings were objected to because test descriptions extend past the boundaries of the containing flow chart symbol. The applicants have amended FIGS. 3-7, 9, and 10 to correct the discrepancies.

Specification

In the Office Action mailed on August 25, 2004, the specification was objected to for various informalities. The applicants have amended the specification as listed above to correct these discrepancies. Additionally, the August 25, 2004 Office Action states on page 4, “Page 23 lines 17-25 indicate that an Option Manager Dialog Box is updated with invalid names (please explain).” Page 23, lines 17-25 of the present application states

. . . group. Style groups are well-known collections of styles that are grouped for various reasons. For example, heading styles may be used to associate various heading styles with a particular hierarchy. Such a hierarchy may be used, for example, to create an ordered table of contents. If, on the other hand, a determination is made that a corresponding style exists in the target document, the method branches from decision block 607 to decision block 608.

If, at decision block 608, a determination is made that the corresponding style does not belong to a style group, the method proceeds to . . .

The applicants respectfully submit that the present application does not discuss an “Option Manager Dialog Box” as stated by the Office Action.

The Office Action stated that the attempt to incorporate subject matter into the present application by reference on page 39, lines 2-7 was improper for insufficient identifying indicia. The applicants have amended the specification to identify U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/876,489, filed on June 7, 2001 as being incorporated by reference in its entirety. Similarly, the applicants have amended page 14, lines 15-20 of the specification to update the reference being incorporated in its entirety as U.S. Patent No. 6,583,798.

Examiner's Amendment

The applicants hereby accept the Examiner's Amendment adding "computer implemented" to the preamble and incorporating the recitations of claim 12 into independent claim 10 and canceling the remaining claims. The applicants further amend claim 10 to correct a typographical error. Specifically, the original recitation "and that the corresponding formatting style has been used or redefined in the target document" should read "and that the corresponding formatting style has not been used or redefined in the target document." The omission of "not" in this recitation was an unintended typographical error. The applicants suggest that the omission is clear when read in light of FIG. 6, see the "No" branch from decision step 610 to step 618, and on page 24 of the specification, lines 3-5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicants respectfully request that the amendments made to the present application be entered prior to patent issue, as allowed by 37 C.F.R. § 1.312. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC



Date: January 14, 2005

By: Leonard J. Hope
Reg. No. 44,774

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

